A U M

The human soul stands even in this life in indissoluble connection with all immaterial natures. —KANT

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLIII January, 1955 No. 3

GROWING PAINS

THE entire scheme of the cyclic mission of Theosophic teachers rests upon the necessity for periodic re-presentation of true ideas. The teacher comes, a body of disciples feels the psycho-moral impact of a great and powerful intelligence, and learns—quite naturally—to respect the elements of wisdom in what is taught. Yet the disciples suffer from uncertainty, else they would not be disciples, but teachers, themselves. So they are constrained by their condition to identify the wisdom of the teacher with its particular form.

There are both advantages and disadvantages in this. The advantages are obvious. If the wisdom is authentic, there is the possibility that from study and practice devotees will in time transform it into their own. The disadvantages are almost as plain. For when a student is obliged to find his wisdom marked for identification, so that he may be sure it *is* wisdom, this reliance on a particular form of expression makes him in a measure vulnerable to facile and ambitious *claims* of wisdom—claims which may or may not be genuine.

Such vulnerability is easy to demonstrate. Suppose portions of *The Secret Doctrine* were scattered at random in a book containing the works of numerous other writers, also quoted at random; suppose, further, that the various quotations were of a sort that give no clue from form or vocabulary as to who the writers were: could we unfailingly select the passages from H.P.B.? The assumption, here, of course, is that the *Secret Doctrine* quotations embody actual wisdom concerning what is discussed, whereas the other passages, of varying excellence, would be made up of guesses, speculations, and errors.

Only the hardiest of students would welcome such an ordeal with confidence in the result. And yet, in the final analysis, this is one of the meanings of self-reliance. We try to hold our teachers in bondage to us, while they patiently wait that hour when we will know the truth, in and of ourselves. The teachers write the books, as a matter of course put up with the pretexts, complaints, and betrayals of "the geese of the ages," returning again and again to the same old task.

It is natural for us to be grateful to them; to speak of them with reverence, and to make frequent mention of the loyalty we feel to them for what they have done. Yet while we express ourselves so, there may be at least a small tendency to take them for granted—to assume, that is, that they will always be there to "hold our hands," comfort our distress, and rouse us from weakness and procrastination. It is true that the relationship between student and teacher, disciple and master, is founded on the great law and order of nature. The Guru-parampara Chain is the form taken by the law of unity or brotherhood between self-conscious beings of unequal development. The teachers come among us—"wait" for us, so to say—involve themselves in our imperfections, or *Karma,* because they acknowledge and live by the community of the human family. Their actions as teachers are actions *as a part of ourselves.* Their books become, inevitably, "authoritative" for us, in the sense that we have come to feel a strength and encouragement in them that is not consistently found elsewhere, but they do not carry wisdom really born, or operative, until we begin to make their contents a matter of independent realization.

The state of the disciple is thus an "intermediate" one. He has come out from the crowd, but he is still far from the other shore. He shares in a wisdom not yet entirely his own. What security, then, has he from his own uncertainty, and from the deceptions of false teachers? Here, just here, is one of the painful aspects of discipleship. No one can give him this security, except in the form of the rules of discipleship. And in resolving to abide by those rules, he feels the isolation from the careless majority which lives in easy independence of the claims of allegiance to a "teacher," and the isolation, also, from the serene certainty which his teacher seems to possess. The student would like to disclaim any "sectarian" connection, since the educated world is so disdainful of the cult and the creed, yet his commitments, not yet fully girded with wisdom, make him *seem* like a cultist. Further, he may even

find himself behaving like a cultist, in fact, and thus gain a strong distaste for the whole enterprise—at least for a time.

Yet without a wisdom of his own, he cannot let go. The teachers must fully understand this dilemma of the disciple. It is Krishna, the avatar, who, "tenderly smiling," waits for Arjuna to outgrow his complaints. And in *Letters That Have Helped Me,* Mr. Judge displays a like tolerance of the slow processes of human growth.

An ironic aspect of this situation is the tendency of some disciples to abandon their teacher—whether, in ancient times, a human being, or in modern times, a book or a recorded body of teachings—in the name of independence and self-reliance. The entire secret of occultism is the gaining of self-reliance through persistent discipline, for in occultism self-reliance means a subdued psychic nature, a trained and active mind, and a will that responds only to the determinations of the higher man. Those who give up the struggle because they cannot stand the discipline only reveal their inability to be truly self-reliant, since the discipline of discipleship has this as its chief objective.

The principle which supplies rational unity throughout all the ardors of this long course is the intuition. Intuition is, after all, the manifest of the spiritual nature. It is by intuition that we cleave to the teacher in whom we place our faith. It is by intuition that we resolve upon a life of Theosophic study and practice. For how could we have self-reliance at the end, if we did not have it, in principle, at the beginning? Yet, as in all other learning, the means pursued must be consistent with the end to be achieved.

The writing of a book which deals with the hidden nature of man is almost sure to produce an entire cycle of sectarianisms and half and total failures on the part of disciples. Some will grow strong from their studies, but there will be others, perhaps many, who will re-tailor the books to their weakness of mind and heart. These latter are the ones who want a book to take the place of self-reliance, even though the book was written to help them to find the way to freedom. The conclusion, then—if there can be a conclusion to such reflections—is that we "lean on" the teacher the least when we share his *purposes* the most; for it is only as we learn to be colleagues of these lovers of humanity that we free them of the Karma of their love. This is "Brotherhood *in actu,* and *altruism*"—or *gratitude*—"not simply in name."

SEERSHIP

THE following remarks are not intended to be a critique upon the literary merits or demerits of the poem which is taken as the subject of criticism. In 1882, *The Theosophist*[1] published a review of "The Seer, a Prophetic Poem," by Mr. H. G. Hellon, and as clairvoyance is much talked of in the West, it seemed advisable to use the verses of this poet for the purpose of inquiring, to some extent, into the western views of Seership, and of laying before my fellow seekers the views of one brought up in a totally different school.

I have not yet been able to understand with the slightest degree of distinctness what state is known as "Seership" in the language of western mysticism. After trying to analyze the states of many a "seer," I am as far as ever from any probability of becoming wiser on the subject, as understood here, because it appears to me that no classification whatever exists of the different states as exhibited on this side of the globe, but all the different states are heterogeneously mixed. We see the state of merely catching glimpses in the astral light denominated *seership,* at the same time that the very highest illustrations of that state are called *trances.*

As far as I have been able to discover, "Seership," as thus understood here, does not come up to the level of *Sushupti,* which is the dreamless state in which the mystic's highest consciousness—composed of his highest intellectual and ethical faculties—hunts for and seizes any knowledge he may be in need of. In this state the mystic's lower nature is at rest (paralyzed); only his highest nature roams into the ideal world in quest of food. By *lower nature,* I mean his physical, astral or psychic, lower emotional and intellectual principles, including the lower fifth.[2] Yet even the knowledge obtained during the Sushupti state must be regarded, from this plane, as theoretical and liable to be mixed, upon resuming the application of the body, with falsehood and with the preconception of the mystic's ordinary waking state, as com-

---

NOTE.—This article was first printed by William Q. Judge in the *Path* for April, 1886, and certain "errata" were subsequently published in the May issue. Through an oversight, these changes were not incorporated in the text of "Seership," reprinted in THEOSOPHY 6:12, but were later published separately, on page 61. The changes requested by Mr. Judge, as well as correction of a few typographical errors in the original, have been made in the present reprint. (EDS.—THEOSOPHY.)

[1] See Theosophist, Vol. III, p. 177.

[2] See *Esoteric Buddhism* for the sevenfold classification adopted by many Theosophists.

pared with the true knowledge acquired during the several initiations. There is no guarantee held out for any mystic that any experience, researches, or knowledge that may come within his reach in any state whatever, is accurate, except in the mysteries of initiation.

But all these different states are necessary to growth. *Jagrata*—our waking state, in which all our physical and vital organs, senses, and faculties find their necessary exercise and development, is needed to prevent the physical organization from collapsing. *Swapna*—dream state, in which are included all the various states of consciousness between Jagrata and Sushupti, such as somnambulism, trance, dreams, visions, &c—is necessary for the physical faculties to enjoy rest, and for the lower emotional and astral faculties to live, become active, and develop; and *Sushupti* state comes about in order that the consciousness of both Jagrata and Swapna states may enjoy rest, and for the fifth principle, which is the one active in Sushupti, to develop itself by appropriate exercise.

The knowledge acquired during Sushupti state might or might not be brought back to one's physical consciousness; all depends upon his desires, and according as his lower consciousnesses are or are not prepared to receive and retain that knowledge.

The avenues of the ideal world are carefully guarded by elementals from the trespass of the profane.

Lytton makes Mejnour say: "We place our tests in ordeals that purify the passions and elevate the desires. And nature in this controls and assists us, for it places awful guardians and unsurmountable barriers between the ambitions of vice and the heaven of loftier science."[3]

The desire for physical enjoyment, if rightly directed, becomes elevated, as a desire for something higher, gradually becoming converted into a desire to do good to others, and thus ascending, ceases to be a desire, and is transformed into an element of the sixth principle.

The control by nature to which Mejnour refers is found in the natural maximum and minimum limits; there cannot be too much ascension, nor can the descent be too quick or too low. The assistance of nature is to be found in what happens immediately after the Turiya or Sushupti state is over, since the adept takes one step and nature helps for another.

In the Sushupti state, one might or might not find the object of his earnest search, and as soon as it is found, the moment the desire to bring it back to normal consciousness arises, that moment Sushupti state

---

[3] *Zanoni*, Book IV, Chapter 2.

is at an end for the time being. But one might often find himself in an awkward position when he has left that state. The doors for the descent of the truth into the lower nature are closed. Then his position is beautifully described in an Indian proverb: "The bran in the mouth and the fire are both lost." This is an allusion to a poor girl who is eating bran, and at the same time wants to kindle the fire just going out before her. She blows it with the bran in her mouth; the bran falls on the dying ashes, extinguishing them completely; she is thus a double loser. In the Sushupti state, the anxiety which is felt to bring back the experience to consciousness acts as the bran with the fire. Anxiety to have or to do, instead of being a help as some imagine, is a direct injury, and if permitted to grow in our waking moments, will act with all the greater force on the plane of Sushupti. The result of these failures is clearly set forth by Patanjali.[4]

Even where the doors to the lower consciousness are open, the knowledge brought back from Sushupti state might, owing to the distractions and difficulties of the direct and indirect routes of ascent and descent, be lost on the way either partially or wholly, or become mixed up with misconceptions and falsehood.

But in this search for knowledge in Sushupti, there must not remain a spark of indifference or idle inquisitiveness in the higher consciousness. Not even a jot of lurking hesitation about entering into the state, nor doubt about its desirability, nor about the usefulness or accuracy of the knowledge gleaned on former occasions, or to be presently gleaned. If there is any such doubt or hesitancy, his progress is retarded. Nor can there be any cheating or hypocrisy, nor any laughing in the sleeve. In our normal wakeful state it always happens that when we believe we are earnestly aspiring, some one or more of the elements of one or more of our lower consciousnesses belie us, make us feel deluded and laugh at us, for such is the self-inconsistent nature of desire.

In this state which we are considering, there are subjective and objective states, or classes of knowledge and experience, even as there are the same in Jagrata. So, therefore, great care should be taken to make your aims and aspirations *as high as possible* while in your normal condition. Woe to him who would dare to trifle with the means placed at his disposal in the shape of Sushupti. One of the most effectual ways in which western mystics could trifle with this is to seek for the

[4] *Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms,* 30 & 31, Part I.

missing links of evolution, so as to bring that knowledge to the normal consciousness, and then with it to extend the domain of "scientific" knowledge. Of course, from the moment such a desire is entertained, the one who has it is shut out from Sushupti.*

The mystic might be interested in analyzing the real nature of the objective world, or in soaring up to the feet of *Manus,*[5] to the spheres where Manava intellect is busy shaping the mould for a future religion, or had been shaping that of a past religion. But here the maximum and minimum limits by which nature controls are again to be taken account of. One essential feature of Sushupti is, as far as can now be understood, that the mystic must get at all truths through but one source, or path, viz.: through the divine world pertaining to his own lodge (or teacher), and through this path he might soar as high as he can, though how much knowledge he can get is an open question.

Let us now inquire what state is the seership of the author of our poem, "The Seer," and try to discover the "hare's horns" in it. Later on we may try to peep into the states of Swedenborg, P. B. Randolph, and a few of the "trained, untrained, natural-born, self-taught, crystal, and magic mirror seers."

I look at this poem solely to point out mistakes so as to obtain materials for our study. There are beauties and truths in it which all can enjoy.

In ancient days it was all very well for mystics to write figuratively so as to keep sacred things from the profane. Then symbolism was

---

* The following from the *Kaushitaki Upanishad* (see Max Muller's translation, and also that published in the Bibliotheka Indica, with Sankaracharya's commentary—Cowell's tran.) may be of interest to students. "Agatasatru to him: 'Bâlâki, where did this person here sleep? Whence did he come back?' Bâlâki did not know. And Agatasatru said to him: 'Where this person here slept, where he was, whence he thus came back, is this: The arteries of the heart called Hita extend from the heart of the person towards the surrounding body. Small as a hair divided a thousand times, they stand, full of a thin fluid of various colors, white, black, yellow, red. In these the person is when sleeping, he sees no dream (Sushupti). Then he becomes one with that prâna (breath) alone'." (Elsewhere the number of these arteries is said to be 101.) "And as a razor might be fitted in a razor case, or as fire in the fire place, even thus this conscious self enters into the self of the body, to the very hair and nails; he is the master of all, and eats with and enjoys with them. So long as Indra did not understand the self, the Asuras (lower principles in man) conquered him. When he understood it, he conquered the Asuras, and obtained the pre-eminence, sovereignty, supremacy." And in the *Khandogya Upanishad,* VI Prap. 8, Kh. 1: "When the man sleeps here, my dear son, he becomes united with the True—in Sushupti sleep—he is gone to his own self. Therefore they say, he sleeps (Swapita), because he is gone (apîta) to his own (sva)." And in *Prasna Up.* II, 1, "There are 101 arteries from the heart; one of them penetrates the crown of the head: moving upwards by it man reaches the immortal; the others serve for departing in different directions." [Ed. of *Path.*]

[5] This opens up an intensely interesting and highly important subject, which cannot be here treated of, but which will be in future papers. Meanwhile, Theosophists can exercise their intuition in respect to it. [Ed. of *Path.*]

rife in the air with mysticism, and all the allegories were understood at once by those for whom they were intended. But times have changed. In this materialistic age it is known that the wildest misconceptions exist in the minds of many who are mystically and spiritually inclined. The generality of mystics and their followers are not free from the superstitions and prejudices which have in church and science their counterpart. Therefore in my humble opinion there can be no justification for writing allegorically on mysticism, and, by publication, placing such writings within the reach of all. To do so is positively mischievous. If allegorical writings and misleading novels are intended to popularize mysticism by removing existing prejudices, then the writers ought to express their motives. It is an open question whether the benefit resulting from such popularization is not more than counterbalanced by the injury worked to helpless votaries of mysticism, who are misled. And there is less justification for our present allegorical writers than there was for those of Lytton's time. Moreover, in the present quarter of our century, veils are thrown by symbolical or misleading utterances over much that can be safely given out in plain words. With these general remarks let us turn to "The Seer."

In the invocation, addressed evidently to the Seer's guru,[6] we find these words:

> "When in delicious dreams I leave this life,
> And in sweet trance unveil its mysteries;
> Give me thy light, thy love, thy truth divine!"

Trance here means only one of the various states known as cataleptic or somnambulic, but certainly neither Turiya nor Sushupti. In such a trance state very few of the mysteries of "this life," or even of the state of trance itself, could be unveiled. The so-called Seer can "enjoy" as harmlessly and as uselessly as a boy who idly swims in the lagoon, where he gains no knowledge and may end his sport in death. Even so is the one who swims, cuts capers, in the astral light, and becomes lost in something strange which surpasses all his comprehension. The difference between such a Seer and the ordinary sensualist is, that the first indulges both his astral and physical senses to excess, while the latter his physical senses only. These occultists fancy that they have removed their interest from *self,* when in reality they have only enlarged the

---

[6] *Guru,* a spiritual teacher.

limits of experience and desire, and transferred their interest to the things which concern their larger span of life.[7]

Invoking a Guru's blessings on your own higher nature for the purpose of sustaining you in this trance state, is as blasphemous and reprehensible an act of assisting descent, and conversion of higher into lower energies, as to invoke your Guru to help you in excessive wine drinking; for the astral world is also material. To be able to solve the mysteries of any consciousness whatever, even of the lowest physical, while in trance, is as vain a boast of the hunters for such a state as that of physiologists or mesmerists. While you are in trance state, if you are not ethical enough in your nature, you will be tempted and forced, by your powerful lower elements, to pry into the secrets of your neighbors, and then, on returning to your normal state, to slander them. The surest way to draw down your higher nature into the miry abyss of your physical and astral world, and thus to animalize yourself, is to go into a trance or to aspire for clairvoyance.

> "And thou, (Guru) left me looking upward through the veil,
> To gaze into thy goal and follow thee!"

These lines are highly presumptuous. It is impossible, even for a very high Hierophant, in *any of his states whatever,* to gaze into his Guru's goal,[8] his subjective consciousness can but *barely* come up to the level of the normal or objective consciousness of his Guru. It is only during the initiation that the initiated sees not only his own immediate goal, but also Nirvana, which of course includes his Guru's goal also; but after the ceremony is over he recollects only his own immediate goal for his next "class," but nothing beyond that.[9] This is what is meant by the God Jehovah saying to Moses: "And I will take away mine hand and Thou shalt see my back, but my face shall not be seen." And in the Rig Veda it is said: "Dark is the path of Thee, who art bright: the light is before Thee."[10]

Mr. Hellon opens his poem with a quotation from *Zanoni:* "Man's first initiation is in trance; in dreams commence all human knowledge,

---

[7] Vide *Light on the Path,* Rule 1, note, part 1.

[8] There is one exceptional case where the Guru's goal is seen, and then the Guru has to die, for there can be no two *equals.*

[9] There is no contradiction between this and the preceding paragraph where it is said, "To see the Guru's goal is impossible." During the initiation ceremony, there is no separateness between those engaged in it. They all become one whole, and therefore even the High Hierophant, while engaged in an initiation, is no more his separate self, but is only a part of the whole, of which the candidate is also a part, and then, for the time being, having as much power and knowledge as the very highest present. [ED. of *Path.*]

[10] Rig Veda, IV, VII, 9.

in dreams he hovers over measureless space, the first faint bridge between spirit and spirit—this world and the world beyond."

As this is a passage often quoted approvingly, and recognized as containing no misconceptions, I may be permitted to pass a few remarks, first, upon its intrinsic merits, and secondly, on Lytton himself and his Zanoni. I shall not speak of the rage which prevails among mystical writers for quoting without understanding what they quote.

In *Swapna* state man gets human, unreliable knowledge, while divine knowledge begins to come in Sushupti state. Lytton has here thrown a gilded globule of erroneous ideas to mislead the unworthy and inquisitive mysticism hunters, who unconsciously price the globule. It is not too much to say that such statements in these days, instead of aiding us to discover the true path, but give rise to numberless patent remedies for the evils of life, remedies which can never accomplish a cure. Man-made edifices called true Raja Yoga,[11] evolved in trance, arise confronting each other, conflicting with each other, and out of harmony in themselves. Then not only endless disputation arises, but also bigotry, while the devoted and innocent seekers after truth are misled, and scientific, intelligent, competent men are scared away from any attempt to examine the claims of the true science. As soon as some one sided objective truth is discovered by a Mesmer, a defender of ancient Yoga Vidya[12] blows a trumpet crying out, "Yoga is self mesmerization, mesmerism is the *key* to it, and animal magnetism develops spirituality and is itself spirit, God, Atman," deluding himself with the idea that he is assisting humanity and the cause of truth, unconscious of the fact that he is thus only degrading Yoga Vidya. The ignorant medium contends that her "control" is divine. There seems to be little difference between the claims of these two classes of dupes and the materialist who sets up a protoplasm in the place of God. Among the innumerable hosts of desecrated terms are *Trance, Yoga, Turiya, initiation, &c.* It is therefore no wonder that Lytton, in a novel, has desecrated it and misapplied it to a mere semi-cataleptic state. I, for one, prefer always to limit the term *Initiation* to its true sense, viz., those sacred ceremonies in which alone "Isis is unveiled."

Man's first initiation is *not* in trance, as Lytton means. Trance is an artificial, waking, somnambulistic state, in which one can learn nothing at all about the real nature of the elements of our physical conscious-

---

[11] Divine science.

[12] The knowledge of Yoga, which is, "joining with your higher self."

ness, and much less any of any other. None of Lytton's admirers seems to have thought that he was chaffing at occultism, although he believed in it, and was not anxious to throw the pearls before swine. Such a hierophant as Mejnour—not Lytton himself—could not have mistaken the tomfoolery of somnambulism for even the first steps in Raja Yoga. This can be seen from the way in which Lytton gives out absolutely erroneous ideas about occultism, while at the same time he shows a knowledge which he could not have, did he believe himself in his own chaffing. It is pretty well recognized that he at last failed, after some progress in occultism as a high accepted disciple. His Glyndon might be Lytton, and Glyndon's sister Lady Lytton. The hieroglyphics of a book given him to decipher, and which he brought out as *Zanoni,* must be allegorical. The book is really the master's ideas which the pupil's highest consciousness endeavors to read. But they were only the mere commonplaces of the master's mind. The profane and the cowardly always say that the master descends to the plane of the pupil. Such can never happen. And precipitation of messages from the master is only possible when the pupil's highest ethical and intuitive faculties reach the level of the master's normal and objective state. In *Zanoni,* this is veiled by the assertion that he had to *read* the hieroglyphics—they did not *speak* to him. And he confesses in the preface that he is by no means sure that he has correctly deciphered them. "Enthusiasm," he says, "is when that part of the soul which is above intellect soars up to the Gods, and there derives the inspiration." Errors will therefore be due to wilful misstatements or to his difficulty in reading the cipher.

"In dreams I see a world so fair,
That life would love to linger there,
And pass from this to that bright sphere,
In dreams ecstatic, pure and free,
Strange forms my inward senses see,
While hands mysterious welcome me."

Such indefinite descriptions are worse than useless. The inward senses are psychic senses, and their perceiving strange forms and mere appearances in the astral world is not useful or instructive. Forms and appearances in the astral light are legion, and take their shape not only from the seer's mind unknown to himself, but are also, in many cases, reflections for other people's minds.

"Oh, why should mine be ever less,
And light ineffable bless
Thee, in thy starry loneliness,"

seems to be utterly unethical. Here the seer is in the first place jealous of the light possessed by his guru, or he is groping in the dark, ignorant even of the *rationale* of himself being in lower states than his guru. However, Mr. Hellon has not erred about the existence of such a feeling. It does and should exist in the trance and dreaming state. In our ordinary waking state, attachments, desire, &c., are the very life of our physical senses, and in the same way the emotional energies manifest themselves on the astral plane in order to feed and fatten the seer's astral senses, sustaining them during his trance state. Unless thus animated, his astral nature would come to rest.

No proof is therefore needed for the proposition that any state which is sustained by desires and passions cannot be regarded as anything more than as a means for developing one part of the animal nature. Van Helmont is of the same opinion as Mr. Hellon.* We cannot, therefore, for a moment believe that in such a state the "I" of that state is Atman.[13] It is only the false "I"; the vehicle for the real one. It is *Ahankára*—lower self, or individuality of the waking state, for even in trance state the lower sixth principle plays no greater part and develops no more than in the wakeful state. The change is only in the field of action, from the waking one to the astral plane; the physical one remaining more or less at rest. Were it otherwise, we would find somnambules day by day exhibiting increase of intellect, whereas this does not occur.

Suppose that we induce the trance state in an illiterate man. He can then read from the astral counterpart of Herbert Spencer or Patanjali's books as many pages as we desire, or even the unpublished ideas of Spencer; but he can never make a comparison between the systems, unless that has already been done by some other mind in no matter what language. Nor can any somnambule analyze and describe the complicated machinery of the astral faculties, much less of the emotional ones, or of the fifth principle. For in order to be analyzed they must be at rest so that the higher self may carry on the analysis. So when Mr. Hellon says:

"A trance steals o'er my spirit now,"

he is undoubtedly wrong, as Atman, or spirit, cannot go into a trance. When a lower plane energy ascends to a higher plane, it becomes silent there for a while until by contact with the denizens of its new home its

* See *Zanoni*, Book IV, c. iii.

[13] Highest soul.

powers are animated. The somnambulic state has two conditions, (a) waking, which is psycho-physiological or astro-physical; (b) sleeping, which is psychical. In these two the trance steals partly or completely only over the physical consciousness and senses.

"And from my forehead peers the sight," etc.

This, with much that follows is pure imagination or misconception. As for instance, "floating from sphere to sphere." In this state the seer is confined to but one sphere—the astral or psycho-physiological—; no higher one can he even comprehend.

Speaking of the period when the sixth sense shall be developed, he says:

"No mystery then her sons shall find,
Within the compass of mankind;
The one shall read the other's mind."

In this the seer shows even a want of theoretical knowledge of the period spoken of. He has madly rushed into the astral world without a knowledge of the philosophy of the mystics. Even though the twelfth sense were developed—let alone the physical sixth—it shall ever remain as difficult as it is now, for people to read one another's mind. Such is the mystery of Manas.[14] He is evidently deluded by seeing the apparent triumphs during a transitional period of a race's mental development, of those minds abnormally developed which are able to look into the minds of others; and yet they do that only partially. If one with a highly developed sixth principle were to indulge for only six times in reading others' minds, he would surely drain that development down to fatten the mind and desires. Moreover, Mr. Hellon's seer seems to be totally unaware of the fact that the object of developing higher faculties is not to peer into the minds of others, and that the economy of the occult world gives an important privilege to the mystic, in that the pages of his life and *manas* shall be carefully locked up against inquisitive prowlers, the key safely deposited with his guru, who never lends it to any one else. If with the occult world the laws of nature are so strict, how much more should they be with people in general. Otherwise, nothing would be safe. The sixth sense would then be as delusive and a curse to the ignorant as sight and learning are now. Nor shall this sixth sense man be "perfect." Truth for him shall be as difficult to attain through his "sense," as it is now. The horizon shall have only widened, and what we are now acquiring as

[14] Fifth principle.

truth will have passed into history, into literature, into axiom. "Sense" is always nothing else than a channel for desire to flow through and torment ourselves and others.

The whole poem is misleading, especially such expressions as: "His spirit views the world's turmoil; behold his body feed the soil.—A sixth sense race borne ages since, to God's own zone." Our higher self —Atman—can never "view the world's turmoil," nor behold the body. For supposing that it did view the body or the world's turmoil, it would be attracted to them, descending to the physical plane, where it would be converted more or less into physical nature. And the elevation of a sixth sense race unphilosophically supposes the raising up of that sense, which certainly has only to do with our physical nature, at most our astro-physical nature, to the sphere of God or Atman.

By merely training the psychical powers true progress is not gained, but only the enjoyment of those powers; a sort of alcohol on the astral plane, which results in unfavorable Karma. The true path to divine wisdom is in performing our duty unselfishly in the station in which we are placed, for thereby we convert lower nature into higher, following Dharma—our whole duty.

MURDHNA JOTI

LIMITATIONS OF KNOWLEDGE

I want you to stop as much as possible any wish to progress. The intense desire to know and to become, and to reach the light, is different from the thought: I am not progressing; I know nothing. The latter is looking for results. The right position to take is the wish to *Be.* For then we know. *The wish to know is almost solely intellectual, and the desire to be is of the heart.* For instance, when you succeed in seeing a distant friend, that is not knowledge: that is the fact of *Being* in the condition or vibration that *is* that friend at the time. The translation of it into a mental reckoning or explanation, is what is called knowledge. To *see* an elemental on the astral plane, is for the time *to be,* in some part of our nature, in that state or condition. Of course there are vast fields of Being we cannot hope to reach yet. But while we strive to become divine and set our final hopes no lower than that supreme condition, we can wholly and entirely learn *to be* that plane which is presented to us now.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

WORD PUZZLES

ONE definition of a Mahatma, in current usage among Theosophists, is that of one "constitutionally incapable of doing wrong." While the very fact that this or a similar phrase is utilized so often in study class work indicates that belief in ethical perfectibility is natural and innate, it is also—or at least should be—disconcerting to realize that the Roman hierarchy maintains a nearly identical doctrine to buttress the claim of papal authority. Whatever distinctions exist between the guarantee that papal pronouncements are "free from error" and this Theosophical belief seem to revolve around the words *fallible* and *infallible,* so these we propose to examine.

First, however, let us note that it is not impossible to establish precedent for the idea of moral infallibility among the ancients. This is easily done. For instance, one may remark the many times when Krishna, in *The Bhagavad-Gita,* suggests that Arjuna may himself some day arrive at a point beyond which all confusion, and even the possibility of transgressing moral law, are left behind. An especially clear forerunner of the "constitutionally incapable of wrong" phrase is provided in Chapter Four, for there Krishna tells his disciple that once the pupil has made himself fit for the highest teaching, "the wise who see the truth will communicate it unto thee; knowing which thou shalt never again fall into error, O son of Bharata."

The emphasis here seems to be upon a kind or degree of knowledge which enables one to transcend the psychic imbalances from which human errors flow, and it may also be inferred that initiates into such knowledge, those who may be rightly called Sages or Adepts, are *infallible* as to ethical motivation.

Like all other statements pertaining to moral excellence, however, this assertion is easily liable to conflicting interpretations and, in some instances, has been invoked by Theosophists who wish to press a claim for the superhuman excellence of all remarks made by a favored personal leader. The reasoning employed in such instances is that if Masters are "infallible," and if H.P.B. be recognized as their one chosen spokesman in the last century, the "logical" successors of H.P.B. must also enjoy something approaching divine guidance. But, without even

taking into account the fact that H. P. Blavatsky repudiated, in advance, all claim to this sort of apostolic successorship, as did Wm. Q. Judge after her death, such unconditional glorification bespeaks a lack of familiarity with both the derivation and the original philosophical meaning of *infallible.*

For, turning again to Joseph Shipley's Dictionary of Word Origins, under the word *insult,* we note that *fallible* derives from the Latin *fallita,* which means "coming short." The English word "fail" comes directly from an old French term *failir*—"to be wanting." Therefore, in original usage, one who is regarded as *infallible* would simply be one who was "never found wanting"—who never fails his fellows through either treachery or indifference. The association of *infallibility* with an inability to make *any* sort of a mistake grew during the centuries when medieval dogmas were consolidated; it was then found necessary to argue that a duly elected Pope could make no mistakes when pontificating *ex cathedra,* or, as Webster puts it "incapable of error in defining doctrines touching faith or morals." Thus those developments of history which gave a special meaning to *infallibility,* in order to strengthen belief in the absolute authority of the Pope, worked a transformation in the usage of a psychologically significant term.

Along with preachment of the doctrine of Papal infallibility came one interesting concession—that a "Pope might be liable to error" when acting or thinking "as a person," but that when he pronounced on doctrines he was guided by God himself, and thus could make no mistakes. On this view, the same man could be both *fallible* and *infallible,* whereas the ancient theosophical teaching implied that Adepts, while incapable of being "found wanting" at any hour of the day, could easily —also at any hour—reflect ordinary human error. According to the records left for us by H. P. Blavatsky, at any rate, her own instructors admitted as much, without any hesitation. They, and she, however, *did* present the view that one who has acquired sufficient spiritual understanding will never reverse the direction of truth in any thought or deed. What seems to be implied here is that final judgment as to rightness or wrongness can only be pronounced in terms of the total series of effects involved in any action, and that one who has reached the status of Adept or Great Teacher is simply one who has gradually acquired sufficient understanding so that the broad effects of all efforts will work for the benefit of humanity.

Madame Blavatsky wrote in her *Secret Doctrine* that she had "never claimed personal infallibility," and since this statement is but one of many made by her, one can only infer that self-appointed "Theosophical Leaders," who wished to be considered H.P.B.'s successors or equals, should have admitted the same. One of H.P.B.'s most complete affirmations of her own "liability to error" appears in *The Secret Doctrine,* II, 640, in the context of the conclusion of Part 3 of that volume. She writes:

> And here, we must be allowed a last remark. No true theosophist, from the most ignorant up to the most learned, ought to claim *infallibility* for anything he may say or write upon occult matters. The chief point is to admit that, in many a way, in the classification of either cosmic or human principles, in addition to mistakes in the order of evolution, and especially on metaphysical questions, those of us who pretend to teach others more ignorant than ourselves—are all liable to err. Thus mistakes have been made in "Isis Unveiled," in "Esoteric Buddhism," in "Man," in "Magic: White and Black," etc., etc.; and more than one mistake is likely to be found in the present work. This cannot be helped. For a large or even a small work on such abstruse subjects to be entirely exempt from error and blunder, it would have to be written from its first to its last page by a great adept, if not by an Avatar. Then only should we say, "This is verily a work without sin or blemish in it!" But, so long as the artist is imperfect, how can his work be perfect? "Endless is the search for truth!" Let us love it and aspire to it for its own sake, and not for the glory or benefit a minute portion of its revelation may confer on us. For who of us can presume to have the *whole* truth at his fingers' ends, even upon one minor teaching of Occultism?

With all these qualifications in mind, then, of what use is the word *infallible?* Very little, it appears. But involved with this much abused term is a basic conception not only useful, but necessary, whenever one ponders the nature of great Theosophical Sages. The word *infallible* came into usage, perhaps, and has remained in use, because it is natural for men to find ways of expressing complete trust in a worthy teacher. Throughout *The Bhagavad-Gita* Krishna affirms that there is a wisdom, beyond and behind the words of the *Vedas,* which liberates its knowers from bondage to the familiar forms of human error. This wisdom is the "Secret Doctrine," always the same in principle or essence, yet, of necessity, presented with different emphases and differing terms according to the conditions surrounding the one who imparts it at any given time. Krishna further tells Arjuna, though, that perfect renun-

ciation must be attained before one will even be able to understand the rudiments of that wisdom. Finally, however, by a series of self-initiations, he finally brings his *kamic* nature under such firm control that he is no longer led astray by vagrant desires.

With this background and these qualifications in mind, we can proceed to grant that the "ex cathedra" dogma of Catholicism has, like all similar teachings of religion, a partial basis both in ancient lore and present psychological fact. The sincere patriot who perceives a great opportunity for rendering service to his nation may acquire enough of *infallibility* to insure that the motive behind his decisions will be pure—that is, so bound up is he in the determination to improve the destiny of those to whom he feels a special obligation, that he thinks and acts impersonally. Sometimes a political leader, like Gandhi, may transcend a conception of service to nation, and perceive that the only duty which never changes is that which is due to all humanity. To carry this example further, would anyone care to contend that, because Gandhi may have made mistakes in minor facts or in dates while speaking to his students and followers, he was just as *fallible* as anyone else? Was he ever "found wanting" according to the highest ethical criteria, once he had acquired the full realization of his influence and obligations?

So the question of infallibility is but another one of the puzzles clarified by H.P.B.'s basic article "What is Truth?" No mortal, she wrote, can ever attain to more than "relative truth"—which means that every transcriber of doctrines is limited by words and method of transmission. But this does not mean that no teacher is worthy of our full trust. Whatever "errors" he makes will never harm the destiny nor mar the vision of pupils, so long as they do not transform those teachings into partisan dogmas. The teacher, in theosophical parlance, is simply one who offers a spiritual line of direction for use in one's thought and study. So long as the thoughts offered bring increased understanding, that teacher is *infallible,* in that his influence moves uninterruptedly in "the direction of truth."

Many theosophical inquirers have been repelled by H.P.B.'s assertion that she was instructed in the essential tenets of *The Secret Doctrine* by adept teachers, for this, they say, seems to imply, first, that she accepted the principle of absolute authority through revelation and, second, that she recommended the same acceptance to those who followed her. Nothing, however, could be farther from the recorded

truth. Again and again she stated that each must constitute his own authority, and that the only legitimate process of revelation is self-induced discovery.

On page 81 of *The Friendly Philosopher,* Robert Crosbie quotes from *Man, a Fragment of Forgotten History,* in listing "the six glorious virtues." The fifth of these, "Samadana," is there described as an attainment "which renders the student constitutionally incapable of deviating from the right path." We note that here the reference includes the category of "student," and does not reserve this *infallibility* for a Master of Wisdom, thus indicating that gradual attainment of purer motivations, to the point where one no longer subverts truth or justice, is possible for any man, even though his knowledge be incomplete. This does not mean, however, that the "student" will be able to transmit doctrines or teachings with complete perfection—since not even an adept can construct any *form* which is absolutely perfect. Thus H.P.B.'s "admission of errors," in this light, is less a confession of personal frailty than the enunciation of a necessary principle to be borne in mind by any student of doctrinal teachings.

Referring again to the matter of clarifying distinctions between Churchly and Theosophical conceptions of infallibility, then, it should be clear that it is precisely the claim of absolute authority as to phrasings of doctrine—which is the root of the *ex cathedra* dogma—that Theosophical teachers reject. One is *infallible* only to the degree that he has attained "samadana," which signifies constancy of pure motivation. The life of such an one is all of a piece, moreover, so far as motivation is concerned, so that we will not find, in Theosophic lore, the notion that one can be pure when serving the interests of an institution, and kamically dominated on other occasions. Aside from the fact that Theosophy grants that all good men will be at their absolute best when serving impersonal causes, theological insistence upon the association of *infallibility* with attainment of a certain official status needs vigorous opposition. For no one can be appointed or elected to *infallibility,* nor can even he who has attained to the supreme virtue of *samadana* be expected to produce complete and unimprovable perfection in the formulation of teachings.

A final question remains: Why is it that the notion of *infallibility* has been so appealing—appealing not only to those who seek moral assurance through belief in priestly authority, but also to many Theo-

sophists? Is it not that the quality of *tamas,* being universal in its application to the lower nature, works in influence of nearly all persons, leading them to wish for easy, sure ways to doctrinal accuracy and moral rectitude? But for the Theosophist who follows H.P.B.'s admonitions, no doctrine is "exact" or "absolutely authoritative" until rendered such by one's own testing and verifying—and even then the exactitude resides in its psychological content, not in any particular expression. Nor is that higher moral rectitude called *samadana* transmissible from one unto another, like a badge or symbol of office. Remains, however, the important fact that a Theosophist's decision to ponder with continual respect the teachings and recommendations of an H. P. Blavatsky may originate in a truly "infallible" intuition.

COMING OF AGE

Interregnums—that is, periods of transitory chaos which follow the collapse of the traditional values of a civilization—are of limited duration. . . . The day is not far when the present interregnum will end, and a new "horizontal" ferment will arise—not a new party or sect, but an irresistible global mood, a spiritual springtide like early Christianity or the Renaissance. It will probably mark the end of our historical era, the period which began with Galileo, Newton and Columbus, the period of human adolescence, the age of scientific formulations and quantitative measurements, of utility values, of the ascendancy of reason over spirit.

Its achievements were gigantic; the spasms of its death struggle are terrifying. But they cannot last much longer. As the frequency of the convulsions increases, the amplitude of their violence grows; the point of exhaustion has come within almost measurable range. There might be one or two more world wars but not a dozen. It is a question of decades, not centuries.

Those who are basically optimists can afford to face facts; they. . . . will not brandish the surgeon's knife at the social body, because they know that their own instruments are polluted. They will watch with open eyes and without sectarian blinkers for the first signs of the new horizontal movement. When it comes, they will assist its birth. . . . And meanwhile their chief aim will be to create oases in the interregnum desert. . . . Let us plant oases.

—ARTHUR KOESTLER

A STUDY IN PREFACES

III

THE *Key to Theosophy* is dedicated by H.P.B. "to all her pupils that They may Learn and Teach in their turn." To have become such pupils means to have already become aware that Theosophy is inseparable from the knowers thereof, that this Wisdom has been in the safekeeping of great sages from time immemorial. Thus the body of the *Key* contains extensive treatment of some of the historical traces and records of those who taught the Wisdom-Religion.

But in order properly to learn and to teach, the pupils must in their turn strive to become Knowers on their own account. They must ever try to awaken those higher and immortal principles in themselves—Higher Manas and Buddhi—through which alone a direct perception of spiritual truth becomes possible. This is the note sounded by H.P.B. in the *Key to Theosophy.* She wrote that her endeavor was "to present unfamiliar concepts in a form as simple and in language as clear as possible"—but:

> That it should succeed in making Theosophy intelligible without mental effort on the part of the reader, would be too much to expect; but it is hoped that the obscurity still left is of the thought not of the language, is due to depth not to confusion. To the mentally lazy or obtuse, Theosophy must remain a riddle; for in the world mental as in the world spiritual each man must progress by his own efforts. The writer cannot do the reader's thinking for him, nor would the latter be any the better off if such vicarious thought were possible.

Another sort of note was struck by William Q. Judge at the time of the projected publication of his enlarged "An Epitome of Theosophy" by the Theosophical Publication Society in England. A "Historical Note," which may be considered the Preface to the *Epitome,* gives an account of the issues involved and the difference of outlook between Mr. Judge and the Managers of the T.P.S., who were afraid to pursue a "dissemination of doctrine" policy:

> It is with great regret that I [W.Q.J.] learn from recent London advices that the Managers of the Society think that the Tract, 'Epitome of Theosophy,' which appeared in the *Path,* is "too advanced to be re-printed now, and that what is needed is a 'stepping-stone from fiction to philosophy'."

> Permit me to say that I cannot agree with this opinion, nor with the policy which is outlined by it. The opinion is erroneous, and the policy is weak as well as being out of accord with that of the Masters....
>
> It [the *Epitome*] is at once comprehensive and fundamental. It covers most of the ground, and if any sincere reader grasps it he will have food for his reflection of the sort needed.
>
> If, however, we are to proceed by a mollified passage from folly (which is fiction) to philosophy, then we at once diverge from the path marked out for us by the Masters; and for this statement I can refer to letters from Them in my hands. I need only draw your attention to the fact that when those Masters began to cause Their servants to give out matter in India, They did not begin with fiction, but with stern facts.... We are not seeking to cater to a lot of fiction readers and curiosity hunters, but to the pressing needs of earnest minds.

The *Key* Preface points to the necessity of *effort* by "pupils," if Theosophy is not to remain a mere collection of tenets, and the tenor of the "Historical Note" to the *Epitome* is to the effect that speculation, *without* the teachings, is also of little avail. There remains to inquire into all that may be implicit in these two varieties of necessary "effort."

Very often additional light is cast on a subject by relating passages dealing with various aspects of the matter under consideration. In the *Voice of the Silence,* we read: "Learn that no efforts, not the smallest—whether in right or wrong direction—can vanish from the world of causes." In the statement of the Third Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine,* the term "effort" is used in indicating the only means by which progress is made when the man-stage is reached in the course of Monadic evolution. From that stage onward, evolution is by self-induced and self-devised efforts. Also, "the pivotal doctrine of the Esoteric philosophy admits no privileges or special gifts in man, save those won by his own Ego *through personal effort and merit* throughout a long series of metempsychoses and reincarnations." (Italics ours.)

Effort in Theosophy always includes and is associated with the active use of the Will, considered as a spiritual principle. The line of demarcation between the path leading to adeptship and that to mediumship lies in the active use of the will in one case, and its surrender in favor of passivity in the other. As taught in *Isis Unveiled:* "Mediumship is the opposite of adeptship; the medium is the passive instrument of foreign influences, the adept actively controls himself and all inferior potencies." Our Teachers point the way to adeptship, and hence their constant admonition of the *sine qua non* condition of spiritual progress:

arousal of the will. Now, sometimes "will-effort" must focus upon the need for original, independent thinking—at others upon defense of the dissemination, as such, of doctrines. For both emphases are indispensable parts of the Theosophical Movement.

This brings us to the Preface to William Q. Judge's rendition of Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms, which appeared in 1889, the same year that H.P.B. published *The Voice of the Silence.* The latter work was dedicated by the author "to the Few," and the translation and *interpretation* of Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms for Westerners by one who was the "bridge between the two *Manas(es),*" the Western and the *ancient* Eastern, was likewise intended for the "few" who, in the words of the Preface to the *Voice,* were determined to persevere "seriously in the pursuit of self-knowledge." The *Voice* and the *Yoga Aphorisms* are companion books. In order to make the more or less abstruse Aphorisms comprehensible to the student, the Preface outlines the underlying psychological system and the method of soul development proposed.

> In order to understand the system expounded in this book it is also necessary to admit the existence of soul, and the comparative unimportance of the body in which it dwells. For Patanjali holds that Nature exists for the soul's sake, taking it for granted that the student believes in the existence of soul. Hence he does not go into proof of that which in his day was admitted on every hand. And as he lays down that the real experiencer and knower is the soul and not the mind, it follows that the Mind, designated either as "internal organ," or "thinking principle," while higher and more subtle than the body, is yet only an instrument used by the Soul in gaining experience, just in the same way as an astronomer uses the telescope for acquiring information respecting the heavens. But the Mind is a most important factor in the pursuit of concentration; one indeed without which concentration cannot be obtained, and therefore we see in the first book that to this subject Patanjali devotes attention. He shows that the mind is, as he terms it, "modified" by any object or subject brought before it, or to which it is directed. . . . While the internal organ thus molds itself upon the object it at the same time reflects it and its properties to the soul. . . .
>
> It is further held that this internal organ, while having an innate disposition to assume some modification or other depending upon constantly recurring objects—whether directly present or only such as arise from the power of reproducing thoughts, whether by association or otherwise, may be controlled and stilled into a state of absolute calmness. This is what he means by "hindering the modifications." And just here it is seen that the theory of the soul's being the real

> experiencer and knower is necessary. For if we were but mind, or the slaves of mind, we never can obtain real knowledge because the incessant panorama of objects eternally modifies that mind which is uncontrolled by the soul, always preventing real knowledge from being acquired. But as the Soul is held to be superior to Mind, it has the power to grasp and hold the latter if we but use the will to aid in the work, and then only the real end and purpose of mind is brought about.
>
> These propositions imply that the will is not wholly dependent on the mind, but is separable from it, and, further, that knowledge exists as an abstraction. The will and mind are only servants for the soul's use, so long as we are wrapped up in material life and do not admit that the real knower and only experiencer is the soul, just so long do these servants remain usurpers of the soul's sovereignty.

In short, the pith of the practice enjoined is that everything that interferes with the Soul's sovereignty must be overcome. As Aphorism 16 of Book I, expresses it: "Dispassion, carried to the utmost, is indifference regarding all else than soul, and this indifference arises from a knowledge of soul as distinguished from all else." This does not mean that the Yogi withdraws himself from the world, and is indifferent to the problems and the struggles of his fellowmen—such would be a false concept of "indifference regarding all else than soul." It means seeking the solution of all problems, and the resolution of all struggles from the basis of the Eternally Real, which is the SELF or Soul. The Preface refers to this as follows:

> *Isolation of the Soul* in this philosophy does not mean that a man is isolated from his fellows, becoming cold and dead, but only that the Soul is isolated or freed from the bondage of matter and desire, being thereby able to act for the accomplishing of the aims of Nature and Soul, including all souls of all men. Such, in the Aphorisms, is clearly stated to be the purpose.

The last Preface in our study is the one to the *Voice of the Silence,* H.P.B.'s final work, if we except the *Theosophical Glossary,* which is really a posthumous production. The Precepts of the *Voice* and its sublime ethics are said to be derived from the same Source as are the "Stanzas" on which *The Secret Doctrine* is based. In the words of the Preface to the *Voice:*

> The work from which I here translate forms part of the same series as that from which the "Stanzas" of the *Book of Dzyan* were taken, on which the *Secret Doctrine* is based. Together with the great mystic work called *Paramartha,* which, the legend of *Nagarjuna* tells us, was

> delivered to the great Arhat by the Nagas or "Serpents" (in truth a name given to the ancient Initiates), the *Book of the Golden Precepts* claims the same origin. Yet its maxims and ideas, however noble and original, are often found under different forms in Sanskrit works, such as the *Dnyaneshvari,* that superb mystic treatise in which Krishna describes to Arjuna in glowing colors the condition of a fully illumined Yogi; and again in certain *Upanishads.*

Here, again, is intimated that necessary blending of doctrinal study and independent research.

The Stanzas from the *Book of Dzyan* are printed with the *Voice of the Silence* as a sort of supplement. Does not this point to the truth that the Golden Precepts of the *Voice* form the "key" to an understanding of the highly metaphysical Stanzas? One must lead the life to know the doctrine. In the words of a Master: "Lead the life necessary for the acquisition of such knowledge and powers, and wisdom will come to you naturally." (*S.D.* I, 167.)

We close with three Precepts from the *Voice* which seem to summarize much that has been said:

> Alas! when once thou hast become like the fix'd star in highest heaven, that bright celestial orb must shine from out the spatial depths for all—save for itself; give light to all, but take from none.
>
> Know, O Narjol, thou of the Secret Path, its pure fresh waters must be used to sweeter make the Ocean's bitter waves—that mighty sea of sorrow formed of the tears of men.
>
> Know that the stream of superhuman knowledge and the Deva-Wisdom thou hast won, must, from thyself, the channel of Alaya, be poured forth into another bed.

Ways of Study

Those theosophists who are in earnest, who know that we are here to learn and not solely for our pleasure, are beginning to see that a few books well read, well analysed, and thoroughly digested are better than many books read over once. They have learned how all that part of a book which they clearly understand at first is already their own, and that the rest, which is not so clear or quite obscure, is the portion they are to study, so that it also, if found true, may become an integral part of their constant thought.

—William Q. Judge

THE REAL TIBET

ALTHOUGH is is clearly emphasized in the theosophical philosophy that the Lodge of Masters of Wisdom embraces all nations and races in its efforts, and that he who looks in one quarter will not find Them, many students have nevertheless come to think of the country of Tibet as the seat of their activities. This is perhaps a forgivable conclusion, owing to the many hints in H. P. Blavatsky's books of the existence of a fraternity of perfected men "beyond the Himalayas," among whom were her Teachers. Such students, then, are naturally concerned over the present occupation of Tibet by Communist China. Perhaps, also, they wonder why books like Heinrich Harrer's *Seven Years in Tibet,* and Lowell Thomas, Jr.'s *Out of This World to Forbidden Tibet,* breathe not a word about these teachers.

Have the adepts been obliged to withdraw, just as in past ages it was necessary to leave other vital centers of work? The remainder of this article collates statements from the writings of Mme. Blavatsky which may cause one to question seriously whether the real, occult Tibet has ever been known to the mass of Tibetans themselves, to say nothing of explorers from East or West. In a broad sense, the "real Tibet" might include other regions in Central Asia besides the territory presently known by that name. The indefinite expression "beyond the Himalayas" may so suggest. In *The Secret Doctrine,* H.P.B. refers to the members of "several esoteric schools—the seat of which is beyond the Himalayas, and whose *ramifications* may be found in China, Japan, India, Tibet, and even in Syria, besides South America." Other collated statements follow:

* * * *

Tradition says, and the records of the *Great Book* (the Book of Dzyan) explain, that long before the days of Ad-am where now are found but salt lakes and desolate barren deserts, there was a vast inland sea, which extended over Middle Asia, north of the proud Himalayan range and its western prolongation. An island, which for its unparalleled beauty had no rival in the world, was inhabited by the last remnant of the race which preceded ours. Their (Lemuria's) elect, had taken shelter on the sacred Island (now the "fabled" Shamballah). There was no communication with the fair island by sea, but subterranean passages, known only to the chiefs, communicated with it in all direc-

tions. The "Island," according to belief, exists to the present hour; now, as an *oasis* surrounded by the dreadful wilderness of the great Desert, the Gobi—whose sands "no foot hath crossed in the memory of man."

What is claimed is simply the fact that the wisdom imparted by the "Divine Ones" to the adepts of the early Fourth Race, has remained in all its pristine purity in a certain Brotherhood. The said School or Fraternity being closely connected with a certain island of an inland sea, believed in by both Hindus and Buddhists, but called "mythical" by geographers and Orientalists, the less one talks of it, the wiser he will be.

With respect to the traditions concerning this island, and apart from the (to them) *historical* records of this preserved in the Chinese and Tibetan Sacred Books: the legend is alive to this day among the people of Tibet. The fair Island is no more, but the country where it once bloomed remains there still, and the spot is well known to some of the "great teachers of the snowy mountains," however much convulsed and changed its topography by the awful cataclysm. Every *seventh* year, these teachers are believed to assemble in SCHAM-CHA-LO, the "happy land." According to the general belief it is situated in the north-west of Tibet. Some place it within the unexplored central regions, inaccessible even to the fearless nomadic tribes; others hem it in between the range of the Gangdisri Mountains and the northern edge of the Gobi Desert, South and North, and the more populated regions of Khoondooz and Kashmir, of the *Gya-Pheling* (British India), and China, West and East, which affords to the curious mind a pretty large latitude to locate it in. Others still place it between Namur Nur and the Kuen-Lun Mountains—but one and all firmly believe in Scham-bha-la, and speak of it as a fertile, fairy-like land, once an island, now an oasis of incomparable beauty, the place of meeting of the inheritors of the esoteric wisdom of the god-like inhabitants of the legendary Island.

One has to look into and study well the Chinese sacred and historical records. From Lao-tze down to Hiouen-Thsang their literature is filled with allusions and references to that island and the wisdom of the Himalayan adepts. In the *Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese* by the Rev. Samuel Beal, there is a chapter which our opponents ought to read. When coming to the sentence which reads: "That which relates to the one garment (seamless) worn by the GREAT

TEACHERS OF THE SNOWY MOUNTAINS, the school of the Haimavatas," the European translator places after the last sentence a sign of interrogation, as well he may. The statistics of the school of the "Haimavatas" or of our Himalayan Brotherhood, are not to be found in the General Census Records of India.

The gigantic, unbroken wall of the mountains that hem in the whole table-land of Tibet, from the upper course of the river Khuan-Khé down to the Kara-Korum hills, witnessed a civilization during millenniums of years, and would have strange secrets to tell mankind. The Eastern and Central portions of those regions—the Nan-Schayn and the Altyne-taga—were once upon a time covered with cities that could well vie with Babylon. A whole geological period has swept over the land since those cities breathed their last, as the mounds of shifting sand, and the sterile and now dead soil of the immense central plains of the basin of Tarim testify. The borderlands alone are superficially known to the traveller. Within those table-lands of sand there is water, and fresh oases are found blooming there, wherein no European foot has ever yet ventured, or trodden the now treacherous soil. Among those verdant oases there are some which are entirely inaccessible even to the native profane traveller. Hurricanes may "tear up the sands and sweep whole plains away," they are powerless to destroy that which is beyond their reach. Built deep in the bowels of the earth, the subterranean stores are secure; and as their entrances are concealed in such oases, there is little fear that anyone should discover them, even should several armies invade the sandy wastes where—

> "Not a pool, not a bush, not a house is seen,
> And the mountain-range forms a rugged screen
> Round the parch'd flats of the dry, dry, desert. . . ."

Tibet or Ti-Boutta, will yield, etymologically, the words *Ti,* which is the equivalent for God in Chinese, and *Buddha,* or wisdom: the land, then, of the Wisdom-Deity, or of the incarnations of Wisdom. The country called "Si-dzang" by the Chinese, and Tibet by Western geographers, is mentioned in the oldest books preserved in the province of Fo-kien (the chief headquarters of the aborigines of China)—as the great seat of occult learning in the archaic ages. According to these records, it was inhabited by the "Teachers of Light," the "Sons of Wisdom" and the "Brothers of the Sun." The Emperor Yu the "Great" (2207 B.C.), a pious mystic, is credited with having obtained his oc-

cult wisdom and the system of theocracy established by him from Si-dzang. And, when we remember that the Vedas came—agreeably to all traditions—from the Mânasasarovara Lake in Tibet, and the Brahmins themselves from the far North, we are justified in looking on the esoteric doctrines of every people who once had or still has it—as having proceeded from one and the same source: and, to thus call it the Universal WISDOM Religion. "Seek for the LOST WORD among the hierophants of Tartary, China and Tibet," was the advice of Swedenborg, the seer.

Even to this day do the Okhals [chiefs of the Druses of Mt. Lebanon] travel every *seventh* year through Bussora and Persia into Tartary and Tibet *to the very west of China* and return at the expiration of the eleventh year, bringing fresh orders from "El Hamma." Even so late as during the days when Freemasonry, and Secret Societies of Mystics flourished unimpeded in Russia, *i.e.,* at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century [nineteenth], more than one Russian Mystic travelled to Tibet *via* the Ural mountains in search of knowledge and initiation *in the unknown crypts of Central Asia.*

After *learning* the whole of the Brahmanical wisdom in the *Rahasya* or the *Upanishads,* and finding that the teachings differed little, if at all, from those of the "Teachers of Life" inhabiting the snowy ranges of the Himalaya, [Gautama, the Buddha,] the Disciple of the Brahmins, feeling indignant because the sacred wisdom was thus withheld from all but the Brahmins, determined to save the whole world by popularizing it. It is well ascertained that Buddhist Arhats began their religious exodus [from India] for the purpose of propagating the new faith beyond Kashmir and the Himalayas, as early as the year 300 before our era. Esoteric Buddhism had begun superseding the ancient popular rites [in Tibet] ever since the time when the Brahmins of India, getting again the upper hand over Asoka's Buddhism, were silently preparing to oppose it, an opposition which culminated in their finally and entirely driving the new faith out of the country. The Arhat initiates had to drop out of the country one by one and seek safety beyond the Himalayas. Thus, though popular Buddhism did not spread in Tibet before the seventh century, the Buddhist initiates of the mysteries and esoteric system of the Aryan Twice-born, leaving their motherland, India, sought refuge with the pre-Buddhistic ascetics; those who had the Good Doctrine, even before the days of Shâkya-Muni. These ascetics had dwelt beyond the Himalayan ranges from

time immemorial. They are the direct successors of those Aryan sages who, instead of accompanying their Brahman brothers in the prehistorical emigration from Lake Mânasasarovara across the Snowy Range into the hot plains of the Seven Rivers, had preferred to remain in their inaccessible and unknown fastnesses.

The Brotherhood of *Abhayagiri* [in Ceylon] called themselves the disciples of Kâtyâyana, the favorite Chela of Gautama, the Buddha. Tradition says that owing to bigoted intolerance and persecution, they left Ceylon and passed beyond the Himalayas, where they have remained ever since. This philosophical school was regarded as heretical, as the ascetics studied the doctrines of both the "greater" and the "smaller" vehicles—or the *Mahâyâna* and the *Hînayâna* systems and *Triyâna* or the three successive degrees of Yoga; just as a certain Brotherhood does now beyond the Himalayas. This proves that the "disciples of Kâtyâyana" were and are as *unsectarian* as their humble admirers the Theosophists are now. This was the most mystical of all the schools, and renowned for the number of Arhats it produced.

Tsŏng-kha-pa, a famous Tibetan reformer of the fourteenth century, who introduced a purified Buddhism into his country, was a great Adept who, being unable to witness any longer the desecration of Buddhist philosophy by the false priests who made of it a marketable commodity, put a forcible stop thereto. He is the founder of the *Gelukpa* ("yellow cap") Sect, and of the mystic Brotherhood connected with its chiefs. Since the reform produced by Tsong-kha-pa, many abuses have again crept into the *theocracy* of the land.

Time and human imagination made short work of the purity and philosophy of these teachings, once that they were transplanted from the secret and sacred circle of the Arhats, during the course of their work of proselytism, into a soil less prepared for metaphysical conceptions than India; *i.e.,* once they were transferred into China, Japan, Siam, and Burmah. How the pristine purity of these grand revelations was dealt with may be seen in studying some of the so-called "esoteric" Buddhist schools of antiquity in their modern garb, not only in China and other Buddhist countries in general, but even in not a few schools in Tibet, left to the care of uninitiated Lamas and Mongolian innovators. It was from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries that modern Lamaism evolved its ritual and popular religion, which serves the Hobilgans and Shaberons as a blind, even against the curiosity of the average Chinaman and Tibetan. The "Shaberons" are one degree

lower [than the Hobilgans]. They are the initiates of the great wisdom or Buddh Esoteric religion.

The lofty system of the early Yogâchârya school of pure Buddhism is neither northern nor southern, but absolutely esoteric. Both in Western and Eastern Tibet, as in every other place where Buddhism predominates, there are two distinct religions—the secret philosophy and the popular religion. The former is that of the followers of the doctrine of the sect of the Sutrântika. They closely adhere to the spirit of Buddha's original teachings which show the necessity of *intuitional* perception, and all deductions therefrom. They do not proclaim their views nor allow them to be made public. A correct analysis of any religion viewed but from its popular aspect, becomes impossible—least of all Lamaism, or esoteric Buddhism as disfigured by the untutored imaginative fervour of the populace. Max Müller says:—"The most important element of the Buddhist reform has always been its social and moral code, not its metaphysical theories. That moral code, taken by itself is one of the most perfect which the world has ever known; and it was this blessing that the introduction of Buddhism brought into Tibet." The "blessing" has remained and spread all over the country, there being no kinder, purer-minded, more simple or sin-fearing nation than the Tibetans. But yet, for all that, the popular Lamaism, when compared with the real esoteric, or Arahat Buddhism of Tibet offers a contrast as great as the snow trodden along a road in the valley, to the pure and undefiled mass which glitters on the top of a high mountain peak.

Unfortunately, Orientalists knowing next to nothing of the true state of affairs in Tibet, confuse the Choichong, of the Gurmakhayas Lamasery (Lhassa)—the Initiated Esotericists, with the Charlatans and *Dugpas* (sorcerers) of the Bhon sects. Schlagintweit says in his *Buddhism in Tibet,* "my brothers never saw a Lama Choichong." This is but natural. Neither the Choichong, nor the *Kubilkhan* overrun the country. There is a mysterious community of religionists, of which nothing, or next to nothing, is known by outsiders: we mean that fraternity of Tibetan Lamaists, known as the Brotherhood of Khe-lang, who mix but little with the rest. Even Cosmo de Koros, who passed several years with the Lamas learned hardly more of the religion of these *Chakravartins* (wheelturners) than what *they* chose to let him know of their exoteric rites; and of the Khe-langs, he learned positively nothing.

"In the book known as the *Avatamsaka Sûtra* . . . it is stated that 'Because from the beginning, all sentient creatures have confused the truth, and embraced the false; therefore has there come into existence a hidden knowledge called Alaya Vijnâna.' 'Who is in the possession of the true hidden knowledge?' 'The great teachers of the Snowy Mountain,' is the response in *The Book of Law.* The Snowy Mountain is the 'mountain a hundred and sixty thousand leagues high.' Let us see what this means. The last three ciphers being simply left out, we have a hundred and sixty leagues; a Tibetan league is nearly five miles; this gives us seven hundred and eighty miles from a certain holy spot, by a distinct road to the west. . . .

"Every description of localities is figurative in our system*; every name and word is purposely veiled; and a student, before he is given any further instruction, has to study the mode of deciphering, and then of comprehending and learning the equivalent secret term or synonym for nearly every word of our religious language. The Egyptian enchorial or hieratic system is child's play to the deciphering of our sacred puzzles. Even in those volumes to which the masses have access, every sentence has a dual meaning, one intended for the unlearned, and the other for those who have received the key to the records. . . . No doubt but that the Chinese and Tibetan Scriptures, so-called, the standard works of China and Japan, some written by our most learned scholars, many of whom—as uninitiated though sincere and pious men—commented upon what they never rightly understood, contain a mass of mythological and legendary matter more fit for nursery folklore than an exposition of the Wisdom Religion as preached by the world's Saviour. But none of these are to be found in the canon; and, though preserved in most of the Lamasery libraries, they are read and implicitly believed in only by the credulous and pious whose simplicity forbids them ever stepping across the threshold of reality."

* H.P.B. has been quoting from the words of a learned Tibetan friend and correspondent.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

A person might love and be devoted to someone or something very strongly. How exercise this same feeling toward the principle of Justice? Most of us will admit that our affections for our loved ones are really greater than for the Truth. Does it mean, then, that if we realize the task to be essayed, i.e., of eventually gaining affection for the whole, we must love those nearest to us less and less? Would not something very vital be lost in the process?

(*a*) The questioner shows a misconception of what true love is. Love implies, above all, understanding and a feeling of kinship. Love for the Truth leads to a greater understanding of and sympathy for those near and dear to us, but does not exclude others. The heart would not have to shut out personal love, but would simply place it in broader perspective.

At our present stage in evolution, few consider it an obligation to be "devoted to all life," too much selfishness being present in our wishes for personal happiness and satisfaction. Obviously then, in order to feel an affection for "the Law," or Justice, we must put this love above our purely personal desires and hopes. With the development of a selfless attitude, putting the welfare and happiness of numbers of others before our own, one gains an open-heartedness, an expanding of mental and spiritual horizons. If the real man is fundamentally identical with all of life, then by realizing this, and acting accordingly, he is fulfilling his own nature, achieving a measure of eternal happiness in the present.

We think of a mother's love for her child as being symbolic of devotion and altruism. Expand this love a millionfold and perhaps you have an approximation of an adept's regard for a just open-mindedness and open-heartedness toward all of humanity.

(*b*) We no doubt can see that it is better to love someone or something rather than nothing at all. Perhaps only through such initial forms of love or devotion may the Greatest Love, love for all men, find food for growth. It would seem to be very difficult to gain affection for "the Whole," to be fair to those we do not know personally, if we did not begin with those with whom we come into contact.

Living in bodies, as we do, there must necessarily be these personal contacts. But only by seeing the personal dispassionately can we reach up toward the impersonal, and gradually extend love to all beings. Feeling the Oneness of life, or affection for the Whole, can not mean we must love those nearest to us less and less. This would be like saying that when the soul becomes one with the ALL, it loses its individuality, so what is gained? It loses a too-personal, separative life, but it attains realization of the ALL. Something is *gained* thereby—not lost. However, from the viewpoint of the one who has not yet gained "affection for the Whole," it might very well appear that the other person has lost something "very vital."

Any kind of true, unselfish love or devotion would seem to be devotion to TRUTH or LAW. When we love someone deeply, it is not the body we love, and is not what we see in them, in part, qualities of TRUTH, made manifest? Is not all true love based on something of the Spirit? If it is, then our personal affections would not be "greater than that for the TRUTH," but would be *one with it.*

(*c*) In contradistinction to what the world knows as love, the theosophic student would do well to reflect upon how H.P.B.'s *Glossary* distinguishes between "Kama" and "Kamadeva." While Kama is associated with lust and desire, Kamadeva is shown to be the "first conscious, *all embracing desire* for universal good, love, and for all that lives and feels, needs help and kindness, the first feeling of infinite tender compassion and mercy that arose in the consciousness of the creative ONE FORCE, as soon as it came into life and being as a ray from the ABSOLUTE." This divine desire became gradually carnalized by man, who has forgotten his heritage. How to regain it? Only those who see the need for it can begin to answer this question.

The passionate lover, indeed, plays his part in the great scheme of things. And how beautifully Emerson illustrates the transition from a love of the personal to that of its opposite: "The rays of the soul alight first on things nearest, on every utensil and toy, on nurses and domestics, on the house and yard and passengers, on the circle of household acquaintance, on politics, and geography, and history. But by the necessity of our constitution, things are ever grouping themselves according to higher or more interior laws. Neighborhood, size, numbers, habits, persons, lose by degrees their power over us. Cause and effect, real affinities, the longing for harmony between the soul and the circumstances, the high progressive idealizing instinct, these predominate

later, and ever the step backward from the higher to the lower relations is impossible. Thus, even love, which is the deification of persons, must become more impersonal every day. Of this, at first, it gives no hint. Little think the youth and maiden who glance at each other across crowded rooms, with eyes so full of mutual intelligence,—of the precious fruit long hereafter to proceed from this new, quite external stimulus." Emerson believed that the "purification of the intellect and the heart, from year to year, is the real marriage foreseen and prepared from the first; and wholly above their consciousness. . . . Thus are we put in training for a love which knows not sex, nor person, nor partiality, but which seeketh virtue and wisdom everywhere, to the end of increasing virtue and wisdom." (Essay on "Love.")

We have often seen the phenomenon of identical twins with physical, mental, and psychical natures so alike that one seems a duplicate of the other. There are known cases in which the psychic tie was so strong that one twin's thoughts and feelings were always known by the other; and when one died the other quickly followed. Nature, it is said, does not produce duplicates. How account for this phenomenon of one human being appearing to be a duplicate of another, and of the strange psychic tie?

(*a*) The very existence of a particular grouping of lives, whether it be a form in nature or that of a man, precludes true identity. Such a possibility immediately admits that life is not for a purpose. There is no necessity for two beings to fulfill the same destiny.

How then can we account for the "scientific" determinism of identical twins? What appear to the observer to be two identical manufactured or natural objects lose their identity when the frame of reference is changed to one of greater magnification or perception. The patterns within, those finer planes which are so much more than the outer man, are not identical.

Nevertheless, there is a reason for the marked similarity of "identical" twins. In the past, some strong karmic tie must have bound these two individuals together. They are individuals, even if they appear to think and act alike. Perhaps in some previous lifetime, the rapport between these persons had been established by a close relationship such as husband to wife, mother to son, friend to friend. The lives led and the situations experienced may have thrown the individuals into a common path of thought and action through some trial or crisis.

We know that we meet our loved ones again in later lives and the relationship is there to renew again. Whatever the reason for identical twins, it certainly must be answered that two souls are working out an old bond.

(*b*) Identical twins must certainly have had a strong relationship with each other in the past. It must be something like a case of genius —a one-sided development over a long period of time—an attachment maintained and continued over much time and with great intensity. But this attachment is not necessarily one of love.

There are twins where one is satisfied to be completely dependent, while the other would rather be free. There are those who love and those who hate their relationship. Of course, parents help to further this apparent identity by dressing and treating twins alike. There are many who drift apart as time goes on. Maybe their karma was simply to incarnate in very similar circumstances.

(*c*) We know that no two blades of grass are alike, but in the case of identical twins, their inclinations toward the same type of thinking and acting could have started many lives ago. Occasionally, we see about us couples who have lived with each other so long that they not only think a great deal alike, but resemble one another also.

On the psychic plane, people could engender karma and form affinities that are woven into the magnetic currents of their natures, with continual experiencing of similar events and moods as a result.

(For unusual instances of "twin Karma," see THEOSOPHY 22: 190; 28: 570; 25: 540.)

(*d*) Perhaps the phenomenon of some identical twins can be explained, by the nature of dependency. A truly "individual" person who can stand on his own feet, psychically or emotionally, as well as mentally, is rare. Many have lost the impulse to be creative, to draw on their own resources. Individual Karma is, in a sense, non-existent for those who act and think according to a set standard. The rapport between friends does not depend upon their being alike and agreeing on every attitude. Instead, the integrity and potentiality of the other is respected, and the desire to help the other along his own line of action is the wish of a true friend. Being psychically and emotionally dependent is far from what H.P.B. calls a true theosophist.

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Needed: A Crusade of all Faiths"

Throughout 1954, evidence continued to accumulate in support of H. P. Blavatsky's prediction that "a few centuries more, and there will linger no sectarian beliefs in either of the great religions of humanity." Consider, for example, the theosophical implications of an article appearing at the beginning of 1953 (in "This Week," of the Los Angeles *Times* for Jan. 1), in which Edward W. Barrett, former assistant Secretary of State for public affairs, gives translations of the Golden Rule from "six leading religions," Christianity, Confucianism, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, and Zoroastrianism. Stressing their basic similarity, he writes:

> The world's great religions are far more unified in their belief in God, brotherhood and decency than most of mankind realizes. Simply demonstrating and dramatizing that basic unity can strengthen the confidence and faith of hundreds of millions. . . .
>
> If they would do so jointly and dramatically, they could reinvigorate the wide-spread religious belief that tyrants have desperately tried to stamp out; they could help bolster the sagging unity and determination of free men; and they could help speed the end of the nightmare known as the cold war.

A World Creed

> Religious leaders are simply urged to join forces belatedly, not in achieving miracles but in helping to forward the cause of decency and freedom. History is filled with cases where people, united and inspired by the right words, have profoundly altered the trend of history—and often without bloodshed. It can happen again.
>
> Actually, the task isn't as difficult as it first sounds:
>
> Ever since the cold war began, statesmen, thinkers and propagandists of many nations have groped for some sort of new and ringing "Creed of the Free World." Yet the essence of the creed had been right under their noses. . . . The basic creed consists of clear and simple beliefs that are shared by all of the world's great religions: *The dignity of the individual; the brotherhood of man; the Golden Rule; the fatherhood of God.*

While we are understandably more than a little prejudiced against the symbol-word "God," because of its long heritage of authoritarian

associations, it is possible to grant that God improves in exact proportion to his accepted universality. For Barrett, perhaps, God has thus become impersonal and impartial—no longer an excuse for self-righteous provincialism.

UNORGANIZED INTEREST IN RELIGION

Mr. Barrett believes that "people are buying far more Bibles, more Korans, more inspirational books than ever before"; and that even "after years of ruthless anti-religious repression, a majority of Russians still believe in God." In the latter case, should this development be encouraged to become a political force? Mr. Barrett thinks not:

> There need be no misguided effort to fit all faiths into a common mold. All that is required is for religious leaders to recognize the remarkable degree of agreement among all faiths, to join in dramatizing it and to spotlight communism's fear and hatred of all religions. . . .
>
> If religious leaders could just agree to concentrate on their points of agreement, the program would not be difficult. . . . The whole could add up to a ringing, world-wide manifestation, not of the differences between religions, but of the great beliefs shared by all and dreaded by the tyrants. It could sweep around the world—across every barrier —as a reminder to all men of their universal brotherhood.
>
> It could be done. And ultimately it could mean the difference between peace and war.

THE HEARTENING FEATURE

That men in public affairs, such as Edward Barrett, Owen D. Young (whom Mr. Barrett cites), and others noted in Lookout from time to time, are interested in minimizing the differences between religions and in concentrating attention on their similarities, surely indicates a growing awareness of the danger of religious "isolationism" in world affairs. The layman may, indeed, through his interest in comparative religion, influence religious "leaders" to forget their many theological differences and recognize the essential unity of all religions. Thus a psychological foundation for a "true religion" may yet emerge—a religion able to fulfill the theosophical definition provided by H.P.B. in "Is Theosophy A Religion?":

> A Religion in the true and only correct sense, is a bond uniting men together—not a particular set of dogmas and beliefs. Now Religion, *per se,* in its widest meaning is that which binds not only *all* MEN, but also *all* BEINGS and all *things* in the entire Universe into one grand whole.

"The Great Bible Controversy"

Early last year, *Look* reported that "the Revised Standard Version of the Bible is rolling high on the best-seller lists, but it has stirred up the fundamentalist lions; one minister burned it, a state senator wants it banned." Objections by supporters of the King James Version range anywhere from the charge of under-playing the virgin birth to that of communist backing. According to *Look*:

> Literary reviewers say both Bibles are here to stay. Most are enthusiastic about the readability and accuracy of the RSV (which has benefited from rich archæological finds), but feel that the ring of some favorite passages has been muffled in the new version.

"Democratizing" the Scriptures?

Although "revised" versions of the Bible have appeared intermittently (one, indeed, attaining considerable popularity about 1920), none has as yet been able to supersede the familiar King James. The generally favorable reception of the Revised Standard may possibly be a consequence of the present tendency to "democratize" culture—where we try to reach a common denominator of belief at the expense of artistic expression.

This characteristic trend was mentioned in *Manas* for Jan. 20, in discussion of Dwight Macdonald's "A Theory of Mass Culture":

> Mass culture, as Macdonald defines it, is the vulgarization, the fragmentation and standardization of High Culture, which, in turn, is the authentic expression of the arts. Mass culture is not artistic expression, although it borrows from the techniques of the arts. Rather it is something imposed on people in the name of the arts.

A Pertinent Question

It is natural, then, to ask if the King James Version, or any other version, should ever have been taken literally. Or was it rather "an original and significant expression" which, for some, conveyed a mood, deepened and widened the nobler emotions—perhaps even stirred the spiritual nature? In any case, to ears accustomed to the King James Version, the RSV lacks the mantramic ring of poetical phrasing, falling short of the requirements of any effective "scriptural" writing.

We have, then, a substitution of watered-down literalism for (*a*) a more dangerous and divisive literalism; but also (*b*) a substitution for the sometimes worthy intimations of art, as conveyed by religious word symbols. As H.P.B. states (*S.D.* I, 305):

> No Egyptian papyrus, no Indian Tolla, no Assyrian tile, or Hebrew scroll, should be read and accepted *literally*. . . . The point to which even the most truth-loving and truth-searching Orientalists . . . seem to remain blind, is the fact that every symbol in papyrus or *olla* is a many-faced diamond, each of whose facets not merely bears several interpretations, but relates likewise to several sciences. . . . Thus the Purânas are written emblems. So are the Mosaic and Christian Testaments, or the Bible, and all other exoteric Scriptures.

The Golden Rule: an Application

In contrast to the Golden Rule as simply an "ideal" expressed by every great religion, Chester Bowles, former U.S. Ambassador to India, suggests that it be used as a positive guide in offering foreign aid. For example, the businessmen in charge of the American Point Four projects in India, attempt, he says, to go on the assumption that the Golden Rule is not merely a matter of faith, and that its precepts can be practiced. Thus, Mr. Bowles—in *Life*: "The most significant fact about all these projects and the whole program is that they begin at a local level. They do not attempt to do good things *to* [or "for"] people, but *with* them."

Satan—Sinned Against?

The Devil, written in Italian by Giovanni Papini and recently published in English by Dutton, is reviewed in *Newsweek,* Oct. 4. In giving the "basis" of the book, *Newsweek* quotes the author:

> Christians, until now, have not been sufficiently Christian toward Satan. . . . Christ loved men, even the rebellious and the corrupt and the bestial, to the point of taking upon Himself all our sins. . . . Is it not possible that Christ redeemed men so that, following His precept to love their enemies, they may one day be worthy of conceiving the redemption of the most ominous and stubborn Enemy of all?

This Thesis Unpalatable

As might be expected, *The Devil* was not well-received by the Catholic Hierarchy. According to *Newsweek,* "the Vatican condemned its theses last January. Papini, who became a convert to Catholicism while writing his *Life of Christ* (1921), is well aware that the ultimate salvation of Satan and the final abolition of hell are not 'official doctrine,' but he would admit them as 'Christian and human hope'." Papini suggests:

> The major dogmas of faith have changed and been enriched. . . . A God who is all Love, as presented by Christ Himself, cannot eternally deny His pardon even to the most famous rebels. At the end of time, that is, of the present world, mercy should take precedence over justice. If this were not true, we should have to think that the Father of Christ were not a perfect Christian.

Lucifer Much Maligned

Theosophists will probably disagree with Papini that Lucifer, or Satan, needs "mercy." He needs *only* justice—recognition of his contrary aspect as "Light-Bringer," "Son of God," "Opponent of Ignorance." The necessity for the dogma of Satan as the Prince of Darkness is shown by H.P.B. in *S.D.* I, 70-71:

> The devil is now called Darkness by the Church, whereas, in the Bible he is called the "Son of God (see Job), the bright star of the early morning, Lucifer (see Isaiah). There is a whole philosophy of dogmatic craft in the reason why the first Archangel, who sprang from the depths of Chaos, was called Lux (Lucifer), the "Luminous Son of the Morning," or manvantaric Dawn. He was transformed by the Church into Lucifer or Satan, because he is higher and older than Jehovah, and had to be sacrificed to the new dogma.

Opposition to Loyalty Oath Continues

Familiarity with the loyalty oath requirement has at least not bred the contempt of ignoring its import, as indicated by the formation of various groups to "fight" it. The Los Angeles *Times,* Oct. 9, outlines the objectives of a Religious Freedom Committee of the First Unitarian Church: "The newly formed committee will raise funds to fight a State law requiring a loyalty oath for churches and other nonprofit organizations seeking tax exemptions. It also will start a tax fund." The *Times* report continues:

Oath Protested

> Many churches have signed the oath "under protest," or otherwise indicating their dissatisfaction with it. A few religious organizations have refused to sign and indicated that they will fight it.
>
> Los Angeles Presbytery, while not opposing the oath as such, adopted a resolution promising "its counsel and moral support to any churches which feel they cannot conscientiously sign the oath."
>
> The Methodist Conference for Southern California-Arizona adopted a resolution condemning the oath.

AN ABOUT FACE

Thus organizations which have heretofore been insistent on conformity now seem to advocate a truly liberal attitude. How much this attitude, which can hardly be confined to political matters, will effect questions of dogma remains to be seen.

THE UPANISHADS

The spreading interest in India's traditional religious and philosophical lore, encouraged by new translations and commentaries on *The Bhagavad-Gita* and the Upanishads, has been mentioned frequently in Lookout. We are happy to report that *The Principal Upanishads,* translated and annotated by Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, is now available in the Philosophy and Religion section of many public libraries.

Dr. Radhakrishnan is one of the world's most renowned scholars and statesmen, leaving an important chair at Oxford University to become, first, India's Ambassador to Russia, and, finally, Vice-President of India under Nehru. *Newsweek,* reviewing *The Principal Upanishads* in its July 26 issue, observed:

> Sir Sarvepalli's book includes the complete Sanskrit text of the Upanishads in English phonetic spelling, his translation, and a strikingly clear commentary explaining their spirit as well as their literal meaning.
>
> The Hindu belief in reincarnation through successive rebirths until the soul achieves union with the Brahma or "world soul" will probably remain unacceptable to the Christian West—despite the fact that ancient Western philosophers, like Pythagoras, and even Plato, once thought very highly of it. Nonetheless, the poetic beauty of the Upanishads antedates and reflects the ethical idealism of the Jewish and Christian heritage.

Even such mention of reincarnation is to be welcomed, and translations of the *Gita* and Upanishads by Radhakrishnan will undoubtedly cause them to appear more frequently.

MESSAGE OF THE "GITA"

In a review of recent Indian books on *The Bhagavad-Gita,* K. C. Varadachari (*Hindu Weekly,* July 12) notes:

> The enormous interest in the Bhagavad Gita at the present time may be ascribed to the need for a saving word which, more splendidly than in any other scripture of comparable dimensions, is given by Lord Krishna in the Gita. There is a supreme note of authenticity as well

as authority in the Gita. It is nearer to man's living interests than to his remote aspirations. It is the voice of righteousness that is insistently heard through its teachings. In another sense, it is the sum of knowledge that has come down to us through the hoary centuries, a knowledge distilled by the integral wisdom of the supreme Incarnate Godhead Himself speaking to the representative man of all times—Arjuna. But it is more than all a living word in more senses than one.

The Gita claims to be an integral method of meeting the demands of the practical mind, divided as to duty, driven by sympathies which could not be discarded and affected by the dire consequences which might overtake the society in which man lives and moves and has his being. Duty has been a very difficult word and a perfect duty or eternal duty has been undefinable not to speak of being unknowable. . . . The Gita cuts across the divisions of names and forms of God, keeping before itself the universal concept of the Deity who is transcendent as well as immanent and Cosmic, universal. All excellences are His alone, wherever they are; and all persons who worship Him in any form or name and in any manner do attain Him. This is the central principle of Universal Religion.

"New" Theories for Old

Scientific discovery continues to substantiate theosophic formulations in several areas of thought. One of the most recent discoveries to make headlines is the "rapid atomic turnover in our bodies." The New York *Times* (Oct. 29) reports:

Dr. Paul C. Aebersold, director of the isotopes division of the Atomic Energy Commission, said studies made with isotopes—variable forms of the atom—had disproved the old theory that the body takes in food, air, and water mainly as fuel to provide energy and only in small part for replacement of engine wear . . . Tracer studies show that the atomic turnover in our bodies is quite rapid and quite complete . . . in a year approximately 98 per cent of the atoms in us now will be replaced by other atoms that we take in our air, food and drink.

Plato's Atoms Still With Us!

Time (Oct. 11) comments more fully, though somewhat flippantly, on Dr. Aebersold's conclusions:

The fastest-changing component is water. It forms about 70% of the body, and about half the water molecules are replaced every eight days. Other fleeting elements are carbon, sodium and potassium. The calcium and phosphorus in bones and teeth stay put longer, but even they are not permanent. Bones are quite dynamic . . . the little

crystals in bones are continually dissolving and reforming. In the process, some of the atoms are lost.

Some of the brain tissues, though soft and juicy, are more permanent than bone. One of the most permanent elements is iron; the same iron atoms stay in the body for a long time. Dr. Aebersold believes that 2% of the body's substance is an ample allowance for the part that sticks around for as long as a year. A human body, he says, should not be considered permanent in a material sense. It is more like a famous old regiment, all of whose members have changed many times over, while the regiment retains its organizational identity. In a larger sense, the atoms that each human body is made of were once parts of other living things—*e.g.,* dogs, whales, birds. The atoms that made up Plato and Henry VIII are still floating around as parts of people now living.

MR. JUDGE'S "BELIEF" SUBSTANTIATED

Since scientists have now proved to their own satisfaction that the atomic structure of the universe, nature, and man is the same, and that atoms formerly used by other human beings are incorporated into human bodies now, the following excerpt from an "Answer" given by W.Q.J. to the question, "Do the physical atoms reincarnate?" (THEOSOPHY 15: 134), is pertinent:

To me there seems to be no improbability and no materialism in supposing that a time may come when any one Ego shall recombine into a body in which it incarnates the exact atoms it once before used, which of course have also been used by other Egos. But when such a cycle of recombination is, I do not know. The Egyptians made it 3000 and 5000 years. It is an idea illustrating for me the idea of universal brotherhood. For if we have all, as Egos, used over and over again the atoms physical which all other Egos have used, we lose all individual property in the atoms and each is common owner of all. I believe, but am unable to prove, that we use over again the atoms we once used in a body, but how many times the great wheel of the solar system allows this permutation and recombination to happen is beyond me and my generation.

UNSOLVED ARCHEOLOGICAL ENIGMA

Theosophists, perennially interested in any archeological findings which place "civilizations" farther back in time, may find suggestive the following from the *Manchester Guardian,* (Sept. 2):

The massive ruins of Zimbabwe in Southern Rhodesia pose one of the great problems of African archaeology. How old are they and who built them? The bearing of the answer is more than academic; for

> if it can be shown that the castle was built by men of African race, then a point is scored against those who say that African culture has never risen above the present level. Some authorities attribute the ruins to Arab invaders of relatively recent date. Of two archaeologists who have studied the site, Dr. Randall MacIver puts its age as "not earlier than the fourteenth or fifteenth century," which would make Arab origin plausible; Miss G. Caton-Thompson suggested the ninth century A.D. Now some new (but not conclusive) evidence is available. In 1950 the curator of the ruins, Mr. S. D. Sandes, noticed some pieces of wood wedged in the top of a drain. These pieces were submitted in Chicago to a radio-carbon test, and later to similar tests in London. These show that the wood, which appears to have been part of a lintel must be 1,200 or 1,300 years old. This shows that Zimbabwe must have been occupied as a site not later than A.D. 750, which is much too early to be ascribed to Arab initiative. On the other hand, there is no way of proving what relationship in time the wooden lintels had to the walls as they stand today. They may have been a relic of a much older and more primitive structure. So the great enigma remains unsolved.

The *possibility* of an ancient culture in Southern Rhodesia (due west from the island of Madagascar) is suggested in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 7): "Lemuria . . . extended from Madagascar to Ceylon and Sumatra. It included some portions of what is now Africa. . . ." The ruins at Zimbabwe, of course, are not old enough to be Lemurian, but since, as H.P.B. said, cities are built over cities time and again, the site itself may be a very ancient one.

Physical Basis of Mental Disorders

"One of England's distinguished psychiatrists," writing anonymously in the *Atlantic* for July and August, again expresses faith in the "physicalist" approach to psychic study—the psychoanalysts, in his opinion, tending to be far too metaphysical. "The mind of the psychoanalyst," he writes, "generally becomes blinkered . . . to advances arising in the various fields of general medicine and surgery and suddenly becoming applicable to the treatment of the mentally ill." He continues:

> It is a pity that medical philosophers have had to seek an asylum in psychiatry in more senses than one, for psychiatry's main proven hope of *practical* progress is to return to a general medical outlook instead of seeking to create an ever-widening gulf between medicine and itself. . . .
>
> Everybody realizes the importance of taking into account the "whole" man and his environment. Yet far greater practical progress

> has actually been achieved by deliberately neglecting this obvious truth and first studying perhaps the blood, liver, heart, brain, or chemical changes occurring in the body regardless of thousands of happenings that may all be influencing these in theory. . . . Today too many psychiatrists are neglecting the brain itself and trying to interfere in functions outside the proper province of medicine; while men of God, philosophers, and politicians are working on the theory that better religion, better houses, or larger prisons can remedy the badly functioning brain.

PSYCHIATRY AND SPIRITUAL HEALING

The anonymous author of these articles is also interested in "religion"—from a pragmatic point of view. If the body can be helped by adopting certain channels of "reason," well and good. The writer compares the results of convulsion therapy to those obtained by revivalist methods. Speaking of John Wesley:

> He certainly often produced, consciously or unconsciously, older versions of psychological and physiological shock therapies to religious ends. He even commented on the part possibly played by physical factors in genuine spiritual conversion experiences. . . . He often brought about physical effects by his preaching, which are now laughed at and scorned by his successors, but seem extremely pertinent in view of the recent successes of shock treatments in psychiatry. . . . I venture to predict that in this new era of attempted appeal to man's religious reason rather than his emotions, it will again be only with a return to somewhat similar methods in modernized form a true revival of the art of spiritual healing and conversion will occur. The real danger is that such methods can be so over-whelmingly powerful in their effects and that they can be used to assist the forces of evil as well as of good. For modern medical research is showing that alterations in a person's emotional and physiological state can, in fact, alter the whole functioning of mind and body, and also alter profoundly intellectual judgment and balance.

THE SOUL RETURNS TO PSYCHOLOGY

In contrast to the English psychiatrist's emphasis on a physicalist approach to psychiatry—with a few controlled "religious" techniques added—two new schools of psychology have sprung up in Vienna, according to the Los Angeles *Times* of June 13. They are the schools of "Logotherapy," led by Dr. V. E. Frankl, and of "Personalistic Therapy," headed by Dr. I. A. Caruso. Both lean heavily on the idea of religious *faith*. From the *Times*:

The new spiritual approach to psychology is based on the theory that spiritual under-nourishment has contributed as much to neurosis as repressed sexuality. It further states that at the root of almost every neurosis lies a moral decision or the shirking of such a decision.

The new concept labels neurosis as "the sickness of bad faith." It considers the neurotic patient as a "fugitive from his conscience." According to Dr. Frankl, the "bombed-out soul" of the present generation can only be cured by a return to religion. He states that the ministry of the physician cannot replace the ministry of the priest.

"It is just as dangerous to ignore the spiritual needs of man as to ignore his hunger or sex drive," says Dr. Caruso.

From a theosophical point of view, Dr. Frankl seems to suggest a "return to sacerdotalism"—seeking emotional peace at *any* price.

Conflicts between Psychiatry and Religion

An article under this title in the May *Journal* of the AMA offers more philosophic consideration of the relationship of religion to psychiatry. Dr. George C. Anderson writes:

Psychiatry serves as an ally to religion in attempting to show the nature of the instinctual unconscious and the strength of the impulses that come from it. Unconscious conflicts involving love, hate, anxiety, and guilt must be revealed and ofttimes weakened before the conflicts can release their pathological inhibiting hold over will power and intellect. Psychiatry has something distinctive to offer religion in this quest for self-revelation because of special skills employed in the investigative method. Man cannot fight his fears in the dark; he needs the clear light of understanding in order to meet the challenges that pour from his unconscious into consciousness. An awareness of one's unconscious often reveals frustrating and creative potentials. This is good psychotherapy. It is also good religion!

Psychiatry attempts to restore man to his proper dynamic wholeness. Man is a dynamic unity; modern medicine has tended to overlook this fact under the domination of too narrow and mechanical conceptions of anatomy and physiology.

An Ethical Issue

Religious critics of psychiatry may have valid objections concerning the possible alteration of personality resulting from lobotomy in which certain nerve tracts in the front of the brain are severed to relieve anxiety or depression. . . . Despite some assurances by leading neurosurgeons that extinction of the personality does not occur as a result of the operation, equally prominent neurosurgeons assert that the patient relinquishes in some measure the emotional charges necessary for the ability to experience exultation and other joys of

living. As long as the question concerning the specific effectiveness of a lobotomy is still unsettled, one can hardly criticize religious groups for questioning the morality of altering emotional behavior by surgery. Whether medicine has a right to advise a fellow human being to give up the struggle with anxiety and retreat to a lower emotional level is not only a scientific question but presents profound theological and philosophical implications.

PHILOSOPHICAL MORALITY

No human activity can ever be free from philosophical implications. As long as man is related to man, the relationships must be spelled out. Psychiatry, dealing as it does with interpersonal relations, must necessarily take some note of the philosophy of the social environment in which the patient is living. This involves the recognition of the rules, regulations, and mores of the society in which the patient is expected to live. Moral values (which cannot be separated from spiritual or theological values) clamor for attention despite the claims of certain psychiatrists that they are not interested in the moral aspects of emotional illness. One can approve the philosophical basis of morality without necessarily approving specific moralisms by which the community hopes to achieve the degree of morality sought. We are dealing with a system of values; few would agree that values are not necessary. But there would be wide agreement that some specific moralisms now practiced may not be appropriate for certain persons or certain societies. Indeed, it is conceivable that certain current mores might intensify the emotional ill health of a person and prevent him from attaining mature freedom.

Without moral values, society becomes chaotic. No one wishes to live in a disordered society. But this does not mean to imply that all theological and moral values are of equal worth. We must separate the wheat from the chaff; psychiatry must have the freedom to explore the wheat-field and to suggest what is of real value to the patient. Psychiatry may not want to be drawn into theological or philosophical controversies, but it cannot help but see the effect of theology and philosophy on the patient. There comes a time in the treatment of the patient when some relationship to philosophy must be made.

PSYCHIATRY AND THEOSOPHY

Both the writer in the *Atlantic* and the new schools in Vienna suggest, by implication at least, a return to emotional religion. The article in AMA *Journal,* however—more philosophic in tone, with less religiosity—has more consonance with the theosophical approach to the study of the lower nature in the light of the higher.